IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P. NO. 851 /2001

PETITIONER : M/s. AMAR BUILDERS HEAD OFFICE AT GANJPARA, DURG THROUGH PARTNER MAHENDRA RATHI S/O SHRI MANIKLAL RATHI AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS R/O VILLAGE SAJA TAHASIL SAJA DISTRICT - DURG, (C.G.)

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS :

1. STATE OF CHHATTISGARH THROUGH SECRETARY MINISTRY OF RES, RURAL ENGINEERING SERVICES MANTRALAYA, RAIPUR. DISTRICT RAIPUR -CHHATTISGARH.
2. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER RURAL ENGINEERING SERVICES - KAWARDHA DISTRICT KAWARDHA (C.G.)
3. SHRI KANHIYALAL AGRAWAL S/O NOT KNOWN, AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS R/O SADAR BAZAR KAWARDHA DISTRICT KAWARDHA CHHATTISGARH.
4. COLLECTOR, KAWARDHA DISTRICT KAWARDHA, CHHATTISGARH.

P.R. No. 666/01 Presented by Shri Yashwant Tiwari dated 15/2/01

Writ petition under article 14,21,226,227 constitution of India for quashing The tender dated 6-2-2001 for the construction of Zila Panchayat Building Kawardha its proceeding acceptantance and agreements and work order on reasons illegal restrainment of petitioner from participating in tender by the respondents, by making forgery in tender of the petitioner after snatched away the tender fomm on 6-2-2001 at 14.00 Hrs.

2. The petitioner respectfully submits as under :-

CLERK TO A.G. BILASPUR

XI-HC-78

102

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... WP 851/01 ..... सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	22.8.2005 On a mention being made, the matter is taken up out of turn. Shri Yashwant Tiwari, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Sandeep Dubey, G.A. for respondent No.1 & 2. Smt. Renu Kochar, counsel for respondent No.3. Officer In-charge Shri A.K. Shukla, Executive Engineer, Rural Engineering Service, Division Kawardha, District Kabirdham is also present. Learned counsel for respondent No.3 submits that due to stay granted by this Court the work could not be executed and now rates of material has been increased, therefore, in view of this fact respondent No.3 is not interested in executing the work in question. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to passage of time and increase in price of materials the petitioner will also not be able to execute the work, if the work is awarded to him on the old rates. He further submits that respondent No.2 be allowed to execute the work in question departmentally or issue fresh notice inviting tender or in whatever manner they want. The petition is disposed of in the above terms and respondent No.3 shall be entitled to withdraw the earnest money or any other security amount deposited by him.	

103

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	Learned counsel for respondent No.3 submits that certain work was already executed by respondent No.3 but on account of stay by this Court the work could not be completed. It is for the respondent No.2 to asses the work already executed by respondent No.3 and to decide the matter. Consequently, all the pending applications also stand disposed of. Sd/- L.C.BHADOO Judge	